

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 256, REPEALING THE AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE AGAINST IRAQ RESOLUTION OF 2002; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1187, ESG DISCLOSURE SIMPLIFICATION ACT OF 2021; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 473 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 473

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 256) to repeal the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1187) to provide for disclosure of additional material information about public companies and establish a Sustainable Finance Advisory Committee, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-5 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services or their respective designees; (2) the further amendments described in section 3 of this resolution; (3) the amendments en bloc described in section 4 of this resolution; and (4) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. After debate pursuant to section 2 of this resolution, each further amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules not earlier considered as part of amendments en bloc pursuant to section 4 of this resolution shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

SEC. 4. It shall be in order at any time after debate pursuant to section 2 of this resolution for the chair of the Committee on Financial Services or her designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this res-

olution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

SEC. 5. All points of order against the further amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules or amendments en bloc described in section 4 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 6. The provisions of section 202 of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622) shall not apply to House Joint Resolution 46.

SEC. 7. House Resolution 467 is hereby adopted.

SEC. 8. (a) At any time through the legislative day of Thursday, June 17, 2021, the Speaker may entertain motions offered by the Majority Leader or a designee that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV with respect to multiple measures described in subsection (b), and the Chair shall put the question on any such motion without debate or intervening motion.

(b) A measure referred to in subsection (a) includes any measure that was the object of a motion to suspend the rules on the legislative day of June 14, 2021, or June 15, 2021, in the form as so offered, on which the yeas and nays were ordered and further proceedings postponed pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX.

(c) Upon the offering of a motion pursuant to subsection (a) concerning multiple measures, the ordering of the yeas and nays on postponed motions to suspend the rules with respect to such measures is vacated to the end that all such motions are considered as withdrawn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. LEE of California). The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RESCHENTHALER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, today, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 473, providing for consideration of H.R. 256, to repeal the Authorization for Use of Military Force against Iraq resolution of 2002, under a closed rule. The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and one motion to recommit.

The rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 1187, the Corporate Governance Improvement and Investor Protection Act, under a structured rule. The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of

the Committee on Financial Services, makes in order 10 amendments, provides en bloc authority to the chair of the Committee on Financial Services, and provides for one motion to recommit.

The rule provides that the provisions of section 202 of the National Emergencies Act shall not apply to H.J. Res. 46. The rule also deems passage of H. Res. 467.

Finally, the rule provides the majority leader or his designee the ability to en bloc requested roll call votes on suspension bills considered on June 14 or June 15. This authority lasts through June 17.

□ 1715

Madam Speaker, there are two critically important measures contained in this rule.

H.R. 1187 will build on landmark reforms like the Dodd-Frank Act and Sarbanes-Oxley Act. It will help hold corporations accountable, help investors make informed decisions, and build a more sustainable and equitable economic recovery. These improvements are badly needed, especially at a time when we are seeing a new era of sustainable investors.

I want to discuss one bill in particular here today, Madam Speaker, a bill that was authored by the distinguished Chair, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE from California, because this Congress is doing something extraordinary.

Nearly 20 years after we passed a measure to address the overthrow of Saddam Hussein and 10 years after the conflict in Iraq officially ended, we are reasserting our constitutional responsibility over matters of war and peace by finally repealing the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force.

This isn't an arcane legislative maneuver or simply some rhetorical exercise. This AUMF has been used over and over again to expand the mission and range of targets of U.S. military operations in Iraq never imagined when it was passed.

In fact, President Trump misused it as recently as last January to justify the strike that killed Iranian General Qasem Soleimani. The impacts of that decision dramatically escalated tensions between the United States and Iran and throughout the region, tensions that persist to this very day.

Madam Speaker, the process that we are starting here today with H.R. 256 provides a roadmap for Congress to get off the sidelines and to stop abdication its constitutional responsibility to debate matters of war and peace.

That is what our Founders intended. They knew that decisions of such magnitude should not be made in a vacuum solely by a President. That is why the Constitution makes the President Commander in Chief but gives only Congress the power to declare war.

It is no secret that for a long time there were Members on both sides of the aisle who preferred to skirt that responsibility. They left such consequential decisions to whoever sat at 1600

Pennsylvania Avenue, Republican or Democrat.

But each of us was elected and sent here to do more than just make the easy calls. We were sent here to make tough decisions, especially when it involves sending our uniformed men and women, the people we represent, into harm's way and shoveling billions upon billions of taxpayer dollars overseas.

A growing number of Members, both Democrats and Republicans, have been working together to reclaim our Article I powers. There is now a bipartisan, bicameral consensus that we not only have to end endless wars, but we have to reexamine the shrinking congressional authority and the expanding executive powers that get us into global conflicts in the first place and, like inertia, keep us there for decades.

The Rules Committee has been working with the House Foreign Affairs Committee to do just that because everything has changed since Congress enacted the original War Powers Resolution over President Nixon's veto more than 50 years ago.

When we fight, how we fight, and why we fight, these are big issues that merit our most engaged attention and resolve. We have a responsibility to make sure that these laws and authorities work in the modern age.

I want to thank, in particular, Ranking Member COLE on the Rules Committee for working with me in this effort. He has been pushing to reclaim Congress' Article I responsibilities, no matter which party controls Congress or who sits in the White House. I know that sometimes it has been a lonely journey, but he has never stopped fighting because it is the right thing to do for this country and for this institution.

I also want to thank Chairman MEEKS and Ranking Member MCCAUL for working with us on this bipartisan effort.

Again, I want to thank Congresswoman BARBARA LEE for being consistent and never giving up in her effort not only to end endless wars but to make sure that Congress lives up to its constitutional responsibilities.

I am grateful that we also have a President in office today who supports reevaluating executive war powers. I have to be honest, Madam Speaker, I never thought I would see that day. But President Biden spent decades in the Senate grappling with the limitations of the War Powers Resolution, and he has a record of looking for ways to change it.

This opportunity is like lightning in a bottle. We have a coalition in Congress trying to get this done, and now the missing piece, a President in the Oval Office with the political will to take this on, is hopefully now falling into place.

I encourage all of my colleagues to join in seizing this moment. Let's make the repeal of the 2002 AUMF the first step in not only repealing and reforming outdated AUMFs but reimaging

the War Powers Resolution for the modern age.

President Johnson once said that it is damn easy to get into a war, but it is awfully hard to get out of one. We are here today because of the truth of that statement.

It should never be that Congress, and the people we represent, are sidelined on the life-or-death questions of when to go to war and when to come home.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the chairman of the Rules Committee, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, the rule before us today provides for consideration of two pieces of legislation. The first is H.R. 256, which would repeal the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force, or the AUMF. This AUMF authorizes the President to defend the Nation against threats posed by and in Iraq.

Madam Speaker, as an Iraq war veteran, I sat literally face-to-face with bombmakers, murderers, and other terrorists who were willing to give up their lives in their quest to destroy America. The 2002 AUMF is the only current legal framework for fighting Iranian-backed militia operating in Iraq.

I agree that there are important conversations to be had about the War Powers Resolution and the future of the 2002 AUMF. However, Congress should undertake a collaborative process and work with stakeholders, like the Department of Defense and the intelligence community, and we should work with them to draft a replacement for the 2001 and 2002 AUMFs before we repeal important authorities for confronting and eliminating terrorists.

If we don't do this, we leave our Nation open to threats from Iran, which is already emboldened by President Biden's kowtowing and his capitulations, so we would be more vulnerable to Iran.

We also leave ourselves vulnerable to other terrorist organizations that are intent on destroying and taking American lives both at home and abroad.

This rule also makes in order H.R. 1187, the so-called Corporate Governance Improvement and Investor Protection Act. In reality, this measure is nothing more than House Democrats' latest attempt to force their radical, far-left agenda on the American people.

Republicans support securities regulation and disclosure regimes that are actually helpful to American investors and entrepreneurs. The bill before us today is meant to appeal to social activists and woke corporations rather than Main Street investors looking to save money for retirement, pay for their kids' college education, or simply build a better life.

H.R. 1187 will push the SEC to focus on social activism rather than investor

interests and use our securities laws to push a partisan progressive agenda.

If you don't believe me, just don't take my word for it. Look at the words of Senator ELIZABETH WARREN. She put out a press release about provisions in this bill, which she claimed will "accelerate the market transition from fossil fuels to cleaner and more sustainable energy sources that mitigate climate change."

Those are her words. The activism is right there. It is written into this bill.

Clearly, H.R. 1187 is about the social justice Democrats' war on American coal, oil, and gas producers and the people who actually work in those industries. It is more about that than enhancing shareholder value.

I would just like to remind my colleagues that under the law, public companies are already required to publicly disclose any material information that investors would find important to making investment decisions. If the mandatory disclosures in H.R. 1187 were actually material, public companies would already be required to disclose them.

Rather, each of these disclosures, but particularly the climate and socially related disclosures, are intended to what I would call name and shame public companies and bully them into compliance with the House Democrats' radical, far-left progressive agenda.

Madam Speaker, at the end of the day, H.R. 1187 discourages private companies from going public; it encourages public companies to then go private; and it limits investment opportunities for hardworking Americans.

While my colleagues across the aisle continue to bow before the woke mob and continue to appease woke yuppies, House Republicans will stand and fight for everyday Americans trying to save their hard-earned money and work toward a better life for themselves and their families.

I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this rule.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I include in the RECORD a June 1 Newsweek article titled "Congress Has a Chance To Reclaim Its War Powers."

[June 1, 2021]

CONGRESS HAS A CHANCE TO RECLAIM ITS  
WAR POWERS

(By Dan Caldwell)

In response to the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks, then-President George W. Bush signed into law the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force to provide the legal authority to pursue and punish those responsible. The following year, the 2002 AUMF was passed to authorize the ill-conceived invasion of Iraq and the overthrow of dictator Saddam Hussein.

Over the last 20 years, both laws have been used to justify military actions disconnected from their original intent. These laws—unmodified since their original passage—have sanctioned combat operations in at least 19 countries.

Successive congresses have abdicated their constitutionally prescribed role in foreign

policy, allowing four presidential administrations to exploit the 2001 and 2002 AUMFs and stretch their Article II authorities. Multiple military conflicts have been expanded or initiated with minimal congressional oversight and debate.

It is past time for Congress to firmly reassert its role in shaping U.S. foreign policy. After 20 years of endless war, it owes its constituents—including our men and women in uniform—a better foreign policy that prioritizes keeping Americans safe. Rather than abdicating its solemn duties, Congress must inquire, “Why, at what cost, and toward what end?” are young American servicemembers sent to fight and die for ill-premised objectives that are fundamentally disconnected from vital national interests. Further evasion of these hard questions cheapens the “true faith and allegiance” they swore to uphold when elected to office.

Over 7,000 Americans have lost their lives and tens of thousands more wounded in Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, Yemen and Africa. These conflicts have cost the American taxpayer over \$6.4 trillion dollars—a number that will surely continue to grow as wars drag on and the cost of caring for veterans of these wars is tallied.

Congress has several ways it can help bring an end to our endless wars while helping shape a better foreign policy.

First, in the coming months the House of Representatives will likely have an opportunity to repeal the 2002 AUMF by passing legislation introduced by Representative Barbara Lee (D-Calif.)—a stalwart champion of Congress reclaiming its powers in matters of war and peace. A similar bill has been introduced in the Senate by Senators Todd Young (R-Ind.) and Tim Kaine (D-Va.), which has been endorsed by the Biden administration. Additional legislation repealing the outdated 1957 and 1991 AUMFs has been introduced by Representatives Peter Meijer (R-Mich.) and Abigail Spanberger (D-Va.). Passage of these bipartisan bills should be a no-brainer for a Congress bitterly divided on other issues and an important first step toward Congress reclaiming its most important prerogative.

Congress should also consider revision—or outright repeal—of the 2001 AUMF. More than the 2002 AUMF, this law has been stretched to justify conflicts far afield from its original intent of authorizing operations against Al-Qaeda and the Taliban in Afghanistan after 9/11. It is worth acknowledging that the underlying purpose of the 2001 AUMF has been satisfied: Osama bin Laden is dead, Al-Qaeda has been decimated and the Taliban severely punished. And despite never being amended, this authorization has been cited to account for operations against groups that didn't even exist on 9/11 in places such as Somalia and Libya.

If Congress repeals the 2001 AUMF, the executive branch still has the authority to authorize military operations to repel imminent attacks and to engage in self-defense (although Congress should take steps to ensure that this authority isn't stretched too far, as it was by President Joe Biden's recent airstrikes in Syria). If Congress identifies a need to replace the 2001 AUMF, it should authorize force against clear targets given specified objectives, geographic boundaries and clear sunsets.

Congress should also use its power of the purse to assert its authority in foreign policy. This is in many ways the most effective tool Congress has and it has been used successfully in the past to end American involvement in conflicts, including Vietnam.

Repealing outdated AUMFs and helping end our forever wars around the globe would enjoy broad support from the American people. Poll after poll has shown a majority of

Americans want an end to our wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, while also supporting Congress playing a greater role in authorizing military conflicts abroad.

I am proud to have deployed to Iraq as a U.S. Marine. Many of those I served with are still in uniform and are still deploying to war zones on a regular basis, even if they harbor doubts about the necessity of those conflicts. Congress owes it to them to step up and do its job by reasserting itself in matters of war and peace. Failing to do so dishonors those who have and who continue to serve overseas in the wars that have dragged on in part due to congressional inaction.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, over the last 20 years, both the 2001 and 2002 AUMFs have been used to justify military actions disconnected from their original intent.

I want to say to my colleague from Pennsylvania that we are grateful for his service to our country. But the fact is that we are still operating under an AUMF that we passed almost 20 years ago, almost two decades ago.

When we were debating that AUMF—an AUMF that I voted against—there is no way that we would have anticipated what the realities are now. The notion that somehow we can't, as a body, come together and revisit these AUMFs on a regular basis, to me, is beyond comprehension.

We owe it to the men and women who serve our country in our Armed Forces to make sure that we are doing our due diligence.

The President has multiple authorities, by the way, to be able to respond to any threats against individual U.S. citizens almost anywhere in the world. But if people are trying to use this AUMF as a way to potentially have a war with Iran, let me just say this: If that is what anybody's goal is, you better damn well come back to Congress and have a debate, and people ought to be able to vote yes or no on it.

Many of us are concerned that these lingering AUMFs are going to be misconstrued and misinterpreted and misused.

I include in the RECORD a Statement of Administration Policy. President Biden supports the Lee bill. He doesn't see any need to have a continuation of the 2002 AUMF. If the President of the United States doesn't see a need to continue it, I don't know why we feel we have to continue something that is clearly outdated.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY  
H.R. 256—REPEAL OF AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE—AGAINST IRAQ RESOLUTION OF 2002—REP. LEE, D-CA WITH 134 CO-SPONSORS

The Administration supports House passage of H.R. 256, to repeal the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (“2002 AUMF”). This bipartisan legislation would terminate the October 16, 2002, statutory authorization for the use of military force against Iraq.

The Administration supports the repeal of the 2002 AUMF, as the United States has no ongoing military activities that rely solely on the 2002 AUMF as a domestic legal basis, and repeal of the 2002 AUMF would likely have minimal impact on current military operations. Furthermore, the President is com-

mitted to working with the Congress to ensure that outdated authorizations for the use of military force are replaced with a narrow and specific framework appropriate to ensure that we can continue to protect Americans from terrorist threats.

In working with the Congress on repealing and replacing other existing authorizations of military force, the Administration seeks to ensure that the Congress has a clear and thorough understanding of the effect of any such action and of the threats facing U.S. forces, personnel, and interests around the world. As the Administration works with the Congress to reform AUMFs, it will be critical to maintain the clear authority to address threats to the United States' national interests with appropriately decisive and effective military action.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank Congresswoman LEE, our Speaker pro tempore, for her longtime advocacy on this very important issue. Her leadership on the fundamental question of the role of Congress in matters of war has been unwavering, and we owe her a debt of gratitude for her commitment to bringing this issue to the forefront.

Nearly two decades ago, Congress passed a resolution authorizing military force against the Iraqi regime of Saddam Hussein. That resolution was aided in its passage by deeply flawed intelligence that we now know had no basis in fact.

It has been 18 years since Saddam Hussein was deposed. It has been a decade since the United States declared a formal end to operations in Iraq. The Iraqi Government is a regional partner, and the U.N. Security Council resolutions referenced have been fulfilled.

There is no reason to allow the 2002 AUMF to stand. It does not enhance our national security. It does not make Americans any safer. It does not make the mission of our men and women in uniform any easier.

We must act so that Congress again asserts its responsibility in authorizing war.

I urge my colleagues to adopt the rule and H.R. 256.

Again, I thank Congresswoman LEE for her extraordinary leadership.

□ 1730

Mr. RESCIENTHALER. Madam Speaker, in addition to making H.R. 256 and H.R. 1187 in order, the rule before us today includes a budget-deeming resolution that puts the House on track for a \$1.5 trillion spending spree.

I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH), my good friend and ranking member of the Budget Committee, to discuss this reckless spending spree.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Madam Speaker, this is complete madness that the Democrats are trying to push through a deeming resolution to spend \$1.5 trillion, and they have yet to even bring it up in the debate.

They want the American people to believe that what we are about to vote on on this floor right now is a bill that

is in Financial Services or a bill that is in Foreign Affairs. But yet they are trying to pass a resolution to bypass the budget process to spend \$1.5 trillion.

The Democrats have been in power for almost 900 days, and they have yet to put a real budget on the floor of the House of Representatives, even though the Budget Control Act of 1974 clearly states the process.

What is it? What are you trying to hide? Why don't you want debate over \$1.5 trillion of spending? Why are you hiding it from the American people? Why are you being so dishonest?

\$1.5 trillion is a lot of money. Your President submitted a budget just 2 weeks ago, the latest budget in the history of the United States. Are you not wanting to debate it? Are you not wanting to discuss it? Because the Speaker said the budget is a statement of your values. Show us your values.

You don't want the American people to see your values because in the President's budget, the largest amount of spending in the history of this country, \$69 trillion, you are putting \$80 billion to hire 87,000 IRS auditors to go after the American people. The largest tax increases in the history of the United States, \$55 trillion. Tax increases on low income, middle income, all incomes. It is the big lie.

But you know what? Across-the-board average increases on everything by at least a 16-percent increase except for things that deal with security: Our men and women in uniform, flatlining our national defense. Not one additional dollar could be found for border security when we are facing the Biden border crisis right now.

More people have illegally crossed the southern border since January 20 than the entire population of Kansas City, Missouri, and you all can't find one additional dollar? It is because you are divided within your party. You all are fighting to defund the police. You are fighting to defund our men and women in the Army, the National Guard, the Navy, the Air Force. Where are your priorities?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. HOULAHAN). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Madam Speaker, where are your party's priorities in defunding the police, defunding our military? Put this legislation on the floor. Don't try to put it in one sentence, one sentence in a rule.

We are 3½ months from a government shutdown, 3½ months. Let's pass a budget, a budget that was supposed to be passed by April 15, according to the law. April 15. Let's prevent this government shutdown.

But yet, Madam Speaker, your side is trying to hide \$1.5 trillion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman such time as he may consume.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I will just plead to the House

Democrats, I will plead to you, Madam Speaker, please be transparent with the American people. We don't want a government shutdown.

But the fact that you won't even bring forth a budget to be debated, your President's budget, you will not bring it to the House floor because you don't want the American people to see exactly how you are trying to destroy the working class, to raise taxes on the low-income and the working class, to put 87,000 tax auditors to go after the working class.

The people see it. They see right through it. And history will definitely, definitely not read well for the House Democrats.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, what a crock. I mean, it is hard to hear anybody on the other side of the aisle talk about government shutdowns. I remember when they lost this place 3 years ago. What did they do? They left us with a government shutdown. First time ever in history, the Republican majority did that.

The gentleman is saying we are not going to vote on this stuff. Maybe he doesn't understand the legislative process. Let me remind everybody that we have to vote on every single cent that we put forward here.

We have an appropriations process. Maybe the gentleman doesn't understand that. But every cent that we spend has to be voted on by people in this Chamber. So nobody is not going to vote on anything.

Let me just put this in perspective. Yes, the President's budget was late, and given the timing of the President's budget, the Appropriations Committee needs to get started to start doing their work, unless my friends don't want the Appropriations Committee to do their work. Deeming a top-line number for appropriators is a housekeeping item that we can take care of so they can move forward, and we can then turn our attention to a budget resolution and enacting the transformational policies included in the President's American Jobs Plan and American Families Plan.

Here's the thing that really gets me when I hear people have meltdowns on the floor. This process has been used by Republicans and Democrats alike in order to allow appropriators to get started on their work. Ever since the first deeming resolution in fiscal year 1999, when Republicans were in charge, overall House Republican majorities used deemers nine times, including for fiscal years 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2019. Boy, how convenient it is to forget about all of that. But, then, again, facts don't seem to matter.

Just one other thing. When the gentleman used the term "big lie," I don't want to be lectured by anybody about a big lie, especially by individuals who voted deliberately to overturn the will of the American people, to undermine

our democracy. I will not be lectured to by anybody on that matter.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the rule we are considering and to speak to the necessity of Congress repealing the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force against Iraq.

Repealing the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force is a good first step towards Congress reasserting its constitutional authority over when and if the United States goes to war. This country has been in a state of perpetual war for almost 20 years. We now have members of the Armed Forces deployed overseas who are the children of soldiers who were sent to war under the 2002 AUMF.

Under Article I of the Constitution, Congress has the sole authority to decide whether to allow the President to take the country into a prolonged war. Before this Nation sends our children, our servicemembers into harm's way, Members of Congress have the duty to consider and approve or disapprove such use of force. Americans have the right to hold us accountable for those decisions.

Repealing the 2002 AUMF does not impede the President's ability to use military force without congressional approval in the event of a sudden threat or imminent attack, but we cannot continue to operate under a system where U.S. Presidents can place American troops in harm's way with no checks or balances. That is unacceptable.

Congress' failure to repeal or replace the 2001 and 2002 AUMFs for two decades has done lasting damage to the constitutional separation of powers between Congress and President. It is time for this practice to end.

I urge all of my colleagues to approve this rule and vote to repeal the 2002 AUMF.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, last month there were over 180,000 encounters at the southern border, almost 200,000 encounters at the southern border. That is a new 20-year record for illegal border crossings, 20-year record.

Alarming, CBP has seized more deadly fentanyl so far in 2021 than in all of 2020. Based on our current trends, we can expect overdose deaths in 2021 to meet, if not exceed, the 90,000 Americans who lost their lives between September 2019 and September 2020, 90,000 American deaths.

Yet Vice President HARRIS, who President Biden put in charge of stemming migration at our southern border, refuses to go firsthand to see the crisis in person. In Vice President HARRIS' own words, "If you want to fix a problem, you have to go where the problem exists." That is what the Vice President said.

Alarmingly, she hasn't gone to the southern border at all.

It would be laughable if this wasn't a humanitarian crisis. It would be laughable if Americans weren't going to die of overdoses because of fentanyl crossing our southern border.

That is why, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to immediately consider Congresswoman ASHLEY HINSON's See the Crisis Act. This legislation would restrict Vice President HARRIS from using taxpayer dollars to travel internationally until she actually visits our southern border.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with any extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. HINSON) to explain the amendment.

Mrs. HINSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to call for immediate consideration of my See the Crisis Act. This legislation would prevent Vice President KAMALA HARRIS from using taxpayer dollars to travel internationally before seeing the southern border crisis firsthand.

Vice President HARRIS was named as the administration's point person on the illegal immigration crisis at our southern border 80 days ago, and this crisis is worsening by the day. Yet the Vice President has refused to go to the border herself and talk to the brave law enforcement officers, the men and women who are fighting this on the front lines.

This out-of-sight, out-of-mind approach is a disgrace, Madam Speaker, but let's back up and look at how this crisis has developed on the Biden administration's watch.

On day one of this administration, President Biden stopped construction of the border wall. Shortly after, he reinstated catch-and-release. Now, this turned on the green light at our border. It incentivized the historic surge of illegal immigration that we are currently experiencing in this country.

Open border policies are music to the ears of the cartels, the drug smugglers, and the traffickers who make their living on human suffering. Make no mistake, business is good for cartels and drug smugglers under this administration right now.

Snuck into this rule here tonight is a provision to set the spending levels for Congress, and these historic spending levels rise in nearly every category except for one, the Department of Homeland Security. This sends a pretty clear message to the cartels that the U.S. Government doesn't think it is a priority to stop them.

Madam Speaker, I recently visited the border to see the crisis for myself,

hear what those on the front lines are facing every day. They told me they are completely overwhelmed. There are major vulnerabilities along our border. These are vulnerabilities that the cartels and the drug smugglers are exploiting every day.

Border Patrol officers are apprehending sex offenders, gang members, even people on the terrorist watch list trying to come into our country illegally, and these are just the people that they are catching. Deadly drugs are pouring across the border in droves. Fentanyl seizures at the border have increased by 233 percent this year. 233 percent.

When I was at the border I heard from both Democratic sheriffs and Republican sheriffs about these devastating realities and the damage that is being inflicted on our communities.

But apparently, even as the administration's point person on the illegal immigration crisis, hearing from those on the ground is too much to ask for the Vice President.

She has been the border czar for 80 days. She has been to yarn shops, she has been to bakeries, and she just flew right over the crisis at our southern border to meet with foreign countries, with the taxpayers' checkbook in hand.

□ 1745

When asked why she hasn't visited the southern border, she laughed. She laughed, and this is not a laughing matter.

The border crisis impacts the safety and security of every Iowan, of every American. Every State is a border State right now.

As Members of Congress, regardless of our party, it is our job to hold the administration accountable when it is failing the American people.

Right now, Vice President HARRIS, Madam Speaker, is failing the American people. She is failing law enforcement at the border. She is failing the families who will suffer because of the drugs coming across our border and falling into the wrong hands.

Vice President HARRIS needs to see the crisis for herself and take action. That is exactly what my See the Crisis Act will force her to do. This bill will prevent the Vice President from traveling internationally on the taxpayers' dime until she visits the southern border and reports back to the American people on how the administration will secure our border.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle tonight to join me in defeating the previous question and holding this administration accountable for the border crisis.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I don't even know what to say. The response to the situation at our border and to the people who are fleeing their countries in Central America to try to seek refugee in the United States, the

response that the Republicans just came up with basically is saying we are going to withhold any money for Vice President HARRIS' travel budget unless she goes to the border and does a photo op.

We are supposed to be a serious legislative body. We are supposed to be the most serious, most deliberative legislative body in the world, and my friends say we are going to withhold her travel budget unless she goes to the border and does a photo op. That is what this is.

Never mind that Vice President HARRIS represented California as a United States Senator, which is a border State. Never mind that she just went to Central America because people are coming to our border from places like El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala. Never mind she went to some of these countries where people are fleeing so we can try to figure out how to deal with this issue.

My Republican friends have brought to the House floor a bill that basically says: You know what? Our solution is you either go and do a photo op at the border or we are going to withhold your travel budget.

I mean, really? That is a serious legislative proposal?

I don't even know how to respond to that, other than to say that, you could have come up with something better. This isn't even worth any more of my time talking about it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY), my very good friend.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I note that the gentleman from Massachusetts just referred to the possibility of the Vice President of the United States going to the border for a photo op.

Well, if she can find the border on a map and actually use her taxpayer-funded airplane, go to Andrews Air Force Base, fly to the great State of Texas, fly directly to the border at the Rio Grande and actually find the time in her duty as the Vice President of the United States to give a whit about the people of Texas, then maybe she could actually have a photo op.

Perhaps the people of this country and the State of Texas, which I represent, would like more than a photo op. Perhaps we would like a Vice President who actually cared about the people of Texas, who actually cared about the ranchers.

As I see my colleagues on the other side of the aisle muttering under their breath right now, how dare I speak up about the people of Texas who want to be protected? How dare I stand up about the ranchers whose fences are being torn down?

The narcotics flying up I-35, running through Boerne, Texas, running through San Antonio. The nine immigrants found in a car being driven by

an American citizen, being paid by the Cartel Del Noreste of Los Zetas out of Nuevo Laredo; the two that were bound in a trunk. The boy that paid \$4,000 to pick grapes but was being sent to a stash house in Houston, Texas, to be put into the slave trade; and little girls to be put into the sex trade.

The 7-year-old girl who I talked to on the border at the Rio Grande at 1 o'clock in the morning, when I don't know where my colleagues were, but I can tell you that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle were not with me. They were not down on the Rio Grande River. They were not talking to that 7-year-old girl who had a phone number written on her arm, or talking to any of the others who were being potentially abused, as many NGOs and nonprofits estimate up to 25 to 30 percent of the women on this journey are abused by dangerous cartels.

It is not the Mexican Government that operates Tamaulipas or the state across the Rio Grande. It is the dangerous cartels making tens of millions of dollars moving human beings for profit.

That is what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle sell as compassion?

Then I watch the Vice President of the United States go down to another country to say, well, what could we possibly do to stem the tide?

How about actually secure the border of the United States?

How about actually use Title 42 in the middle of a global pandemic to make sure that we control the flow at the border?

How about actually have the infrastructure in place that we know works?

How about a return to Mexico policy where we can work with our friends in Mexico to stop the flow?

How about not putting a big neon sign on the border saying: "Come on in. Don't mind if the cartels abuse you on the way."

Meanwhile, Texas takes the brunt of it: an 800 percent increase over the last 4 years total in fentanyl; 800 percent more this year alone.

Do you know how dangerous fentanyl is, Madam Speaker?

We have had 7,500 pounds of fentanyl. 7,500 pounds that have been acquired by border patrol. Imagine what they might acquire if they weren't limited in resources. Imagine what they might acquire if they weren't undertaking processing in McAllen instead of having wide open spaces between our ports of entry. 7,500 pounds, an 800 percent increase in Texas. My State is under siege. My State is taking it on the chin because Democrats refuse to secure the border of the United States.

It is the fundamental duty of a nation to secure its border. The fundamental duty. I come back here after 3 weeks talking to ranchers and people in my State who are getting abused, losing their ranches, losing their homes, watching their kids die in overdoses, all while migrants get put in

stash houses and get abused running up through my neighborhood and my communities.

Well, forgive me if I am not all that bothered by a resolution on this floor by my colleague from Iowa. And I think it is a good idea to try to call into question what the Vice President of the United States is actually spending her time doing.

What on Earth is more important than securing the border of the United States? And how hard is it to get on your taxpayer-funded plane and fly to south Texas and go meet with the border patrol and meet with the ranchers and meet with the migrants and meet with the business owners who are getting killed?

It is happening every single day in our State. It is our duty in the people's House to secure the border of this Nation. And I have constituents and people back home in Texas asking: What are we getting out of this deal? What are we getting out of our deal as being a part of the Union when the country won't even secure the border of our State and our communities? They are asking me that question.

We have a job to come together here on this floor in this body and do our job to secure the border of the United States.

I commend the gentlewoman from Iowa for offering this resolution.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentleman can come and huff and puff all he wants on the House floor, but, again, I remind people that the solution that is being put forward by my Republican friends is to withhold the Vice President's travel budget until she does a photo op. I think this is beneath, quite frankly, the dignity of this legislative body.

I would also say to the gentleman that what the Vice President was trying to do was get at the source of migration, of people coming to our border, trying to solve the problem. She was spending her time trying to figure out how to solve the problem, not try to figure out how to overturn the last election; not trying to figure out how to reinstate the last President who lost the election not only fair and square, but by a pretty big margin, but actually trying to solve problems.

It is hard to sit here and listen to some of the things we have listened to here today and then be told: Oh, here is our proposal.

I mean, come on. Give me a break.

Let's get back to trying to figure out to solve problems rather than try to score political points. And if you are going to try to score political points, certainly you can come up with a better idea than this.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 1187 is House Democrats' latest attempt to force a

radical progressive agenda on the American people by turning the SEC into the social policy police.

While my colleagues across the aisle continue to capitulate to the woke yuppies, continue to bow down in fear to the woke mob, House Republicans will fight for policies that help everyday Americans build better lives for themselves.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question and "no" on the underlying measure.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I don't know what the gentleman was talking about, about woke yuppies and all this other kind of stuff he was talking about here today, but Democrats actually believe in science. We believe that climate change is real. We believe that we ought to have some accountability, especially in the corporate world, as to what they are doing and how they are reporting their actions.

I find this so concerning that we can't even have a debate on what, in fact, the underlying legislation is. I think the bill that Congresswoman WATERS has brought to the floor is a commonsense bill that I hope even some Republicans might support.

I would also say that the other piece of legislation that we were talking about here today is BARBARA LEE's bill to repeal the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force. Many of us have been urging that we repeal that 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force for quite a while now. It has passed the House and it has passed committee. Yet here we are again, and now we have a President of the United States that says that he no longer wants that, that he actually supports what we are trying to do here. Yet we still have people on the House floor who say, no, we need to hold onto it, an Authorization for Use of Military Force that we passed almost 20 years ago that somehow is applicable today. That just doesn't make any sense to me.

People like Congresswoman LEE; Congressman ADAM SMITH; the late Republican Congressman, Walter Jones; and Congressman TOM COLE have talked about the need for us to reclaim our constitutional powers when it comes to committing American forces into harm's way.

Quite frankly, many of us have been raising this issue—didn't matter who was in the White House, whether it was a Democrat or a Republican—because we think it is the right thing to do. We think somehow it is cowardice for Congress to just keep on kicking the can down the road to ignoring these important debates.

You have those debates, and if people decide to continue the same old, same old, fine. That is what the majority of people here vote for. If people decide to end it, that ought to be fine, too. That is what we are here for.



I think this institution would be better served if we took our constitutional responsibilities with regard to war and peace more seriously.

Today, I hope we will pass this rule and we will then pass the Lee bill. But it isn't the end of our work. We are going to need to continue to review and repeal and reform outdated Authorizations for Use of Military Force, and we need to reimagine the broader issues embedded in the War Powers Resolution, because never again should we acquiesce and allow Congress to sit on the sidelines as wars are crafted and carried out by the White House, wars that never end, wars that sacrifice lives and sacrifice treasure.

Let's respect our troops. Let's respect their families. Let's respect this institution. Let's finally get back to doing our jobs, taking responsibility and voting on issues of war and peace. And let's start today by supporting this rule and the underlying measures.

The material previously referred to by Mr. RESCHENTHALER is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 473

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 9. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 3403) to limit travel by the Vice President until after certain activities are undertaken with respect to the southwest border, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 10. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3403.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 6 p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1833

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 6 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, June 4, 2021.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
*The Speaker, House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a scanned copy of a letter received from Ms. Mandy Vigil, Elections Director, New Mexico Office of the Secretary of State, indicating that, according to the preliminary results of the Special Election held June 1, 2021, the Honorable Melanie Ann Stansbury was elected Representative to Congress for the First Congressional District, State of New Mexico.

With best wishes, I am,  
Sincerely,

GLORIA J. LETT.

MAGGIE TOULOUSE OLIVER,  
SECRETARY OF STATE,  
Santa Fe, New Mexico, June 3, 2021.

Hon. CHERYL L. JOHNSON,  
*Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MS. JOHNSON: This is to advise you that the unofficial results of the Special Election held on Tuesday, June 1, 2021, for Representative in Congress from the 1st Congressional District of New Mexico, show that Melanie Ann Stansbury received 79,625 votes or 60% of the total number of votes cast for that office.

It would appear from these unofficial results that Melanie Ann Stansbury was elected as Representative in Congress from the 1st Congressional District of New Mexico.

To the best of our knowledge and belief at this time, there is no contest to this election.

As soon as the official results are certified to this office by all counties involved, an official Certificate of Election will be prepared for transmittal as required by law.

Sincerely,

MANDY VIGIL,  
*Election Director, New Mexico*  
*Office of the Secretary of State.*

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE MELANIE A. STANSBURY, OF NEW MEXICO, AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

Ms. HERRELL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New Mexico, the Honorable MELANIE ANN STANSBURY, be permitted to take the oath of office today.

Her certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest and no question has been raised with regard to her election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Will Representative-elect STANSBURY and the members of

the New Mexico delegation present themselves in the well.

All Members will rise and the Representative-elect will please raise her right hand.

Ms. STANSBURY appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations, you are now a Member of the 117th Congress.

WELCOMING THE HONORABLE MELANIE A. STANSBURY TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. HERRELL) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Ms. HERRELL. Madam Speaker, I have the distinct honor to rise today as the dean of our delegation to introduce the newest Member of the House of Representatives from New Mexico's First Congressional District: MELANIE STANSBURY.

Melanie was born in Farmington and grew up in the North Valley and west side of Albuquerque. She is from a hardworking family that typifies millions of New Mexicans. MELANIE's mother supported her family as a seamstress and heavy equipment operator. Her family owned a landscaping and irrigation business, where she worked growing up.

After graduating from Cibola High School, she attended St. Mary's College in California and went on to graduate studies at Cornell University. She came home and served our State as a science instructor through the Museum of Natural History, visiting schools across the State.

Before she was elected to office, MELANIE served our Nation here in Washington at the Office of Management and Budget, and the U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Congresswoman STANSBURY has been shown to be a dedicated public servant, and I know she does not take her new role lightly. I pray that God will guide her in her decisions, strengthen her during trials, and bless all of us in public service with wisdom and grace.

Today, please help me welcome the newest Member of the House from the Land of Enchantment, Congresswoman MELANIE STANSBURY.

The SPEAKER. We welcome back to the House three former Members of the House: Senator HEINRICH; Senator BEN RAY LUJÁN; and visiting from Washington State, Senator CANTWELL.